

REMARKS

During a recent Interview conducted with the Examiner in connection with a related continuation-in-part application (App. Ser. No. 11/512,001), Applicant requested information on the status of this application (App. Ser. No. 10/667,695). The Examiner informed Applicant that a response to an Office Action that was issued on February 15, 2008 was outstanding.

Applicant explained that no Office Action had been received, and that a copy of the Office Action was not available under the Image File Wrapper tab of the USPTO's PAIR System. Since Applicant had not received the Office Action and had no electronic access to it on the PAIR System, Applicant requested information from the Examiner on the content of the Office Action.

Yesterday, the Examiner orally informed Applicant that Applicant's Amendment and Response dated November 26, 2007 improperly designated claim 53 as "Previously Amended" even though it was currently being amended. Thus, a designation of "Currently Amended" was required. Based on the Interview with the Examiner, Applicant understands that this was the only action that was required by the Office Action that Applicant did not receive. Based on the Interview, Applicant herewith submits a copy of the claims submitted in connection with Applicant's previous Amendment and Response with the appropriate "Currently Amended" designation of claim 53.

To ease the Examiner's burden and for purposes of clarity, Applicant also includes below the substantive remarks that were submitted in connection with Applicant's previous Amendment and Response.

Since no formal Office Action was received, and because it was never made available on the PAIR system, Applicant believes that it should not be required to pay the fee for the Petition for Extension of Time. However, if it is determined that the fee is necessary, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 07-1730.

**REMARKS SUBMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
DATED NOVEMBER 26, 2007**

Applicant notes with appreciation the continued allowance of claims 45 and 46 as written.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for his time in conducting a brief telephone Interview on November 1, 2007 to discuss rejected claims 39-41, 43, 50 and 53. During the Interview, Applicant took some time to explain the history of the case, including Applicant's communication difficulties with the previous Examiner. In particular, in response to a number of amendments made by Applicant, each of which were written to accept allowable claims and place the application in condition for allowance (while leaving other claims to be prosecuted in a continuation case), the former Examiner repeatedly withdrew previously allowable subject matter and failed to return calls by Applicant to schedule an Interview. Thus, Applicant is thankful that Examiner Nguyen has made himself available to discuss this case in detail.

Based on the Interview with the Examiner, Applicant has amended the pending rejected claims, primarily to distinguish the claims over U.S. Patent No. 5,768,722 ("Olson"). Each of the rejected claims is discussed below.

Claim 39

As proposed during the Interview, claim 39 has been amended to require that the tightening member be rotatable. Some examples of Applicant's fastening members having a rotatable tightening member are provided in Figs. 5, 7 and 16.

In addition, claim 39 now requires that the handle portion comprise a projection extending away from the fastening member. Examples of this feature are also provided in Figs. 5, 7 and 16.

In addition to the foregoing amendments, Applicant has also amended claim 39 to

require that the fastening member be constructed so as to permit fastening and unfastening from the interior area (that is being protected).

Claim 40

Applicant has canceled claim 40.

Claim 41

As proposed during the Interview, claim 40 has been amended to require that the tightening member be rotatable. The other amendments proposed in connection with claim 39 have not been incorporated.

Claim 43

During the Interview, the Examiner shed some light on the rejection of this claim, which is found on page 4 of the Office Action as it pertains to Olson's hanging members.

In order to distinguish this claim over the prior art, Applicant has amended the claim to require (a) that at least one of said fastening members have a hooked portion and a rotatable tightening member that together engage the support structure, and (b) a handle portion attached to at least one fastening member, the handle portion comprising a projection extending away from the fastening member.

Claim 50

Applicant has made some cosmetic changes to this claim for purposes of clarity.

Substantively however, and as explained during the Interview, Olson does not include pairing members that comprise a rivet, as required by claim 50. An illustrative rivet of Applicant's invention is shown in Figs. 19-22, the purpose of which is to keep the fastener securely attached to the section of material at all times. The advantage of having a riveted fastener (versus a fastener that is attached to the material via a grommet) is that the riveted fastener cannot be misplaced by the user when the device is disengaged. Based on the

foregoing, it is clear that claim 50 distinguishes over the cited art.

Claim 53

Amended claim 53 now requires fastening members to include a screwed tightening member and a curved handle extending from the fastening members for holding the fastening member.

New Claims

Applicant has also submitted new claims 55-59 for examination. Applicant contends that these claims are readily distinguishable over Olson and other art previously cited in connection with this application.

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are distinguishable over the cited prior art made of record in this case. Accordingly, early and favorable action is requested. To the extent that the Examiner believes that minor additional amendments are required, Applicant invites the Examiner to call Applicant and discuss such changes.

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant
270 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Phone: (212) 684-3900
Fax: (212) 684-3999

Date: July 3, 2008
New York, New York

By: 

Steven Stern (Reg. No. 50,320)
James Reisman (Reg. No. 22,007)